



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| | | | | |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
| 10/769,744 | 01/30/2004 | Anna Helgadottir | 30847/2051-004 | 6429 |
| 4743 | 7590 | 04/30/2008 | | |
| MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP 233 S. WACKER DRIVE, SUITE 6300 SEARS TOWER CHICAGO, IL 60606 | | | EXAMINER | |
| | | | GEMBIEH, SHIRLEY V | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1614 | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 04/30/2008 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/769,744 | HELGADOTTIR ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | SHIRLEY V. GEMBEH | 1614 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) SHIRLEY V. GEMBEH.

(3) Sharon Sintich.

(2) David Gass.

(4) Ardin Marschel.

Date of Interview: 4/22/08.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: N/A.

Claim(s) discussed: N/A.

Identification of prior art discussed: Rossoni et al, Gompetz et al Folco et al and Byrum et al of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants disagreed with the position of combining the prior art in the obviousness rejection, also that the model used (rabbit) is not the same model they used. Examiner agreed to look at the models again however, finds the rejection was properly done from the teachings of the prior art.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Shirley V. Gembeh/ 4/23/08

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an
Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required